

P24



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/219,071	12/22/1998	RICHARD E. HEADLEY		2289

7590 10/07/2003

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI  
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP  
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/219,071

Applicant(s)

HEADLEY ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 50 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1 – 7, 12, 13, 17, 24 – 27, 29, 31, 40, 44 – 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Barroux U. S. Patent No. 6182110.

4. Referencing claim 1, Barroux teaches a job scheduling device for scheduling jobs to run on at least one node of at least one computing platform, comprising:

Art Unit: 2143

5. an enterprise scheduling agent installed on each node and configured to launch execution of jobs submitted to the agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 30 & col. 18, line 40 – col. 19, line 67);

6. a presentation system configured to accept and validate parameters identifying at least one job to be submitted for execution on at least one of said nodes, ( e.g. col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 44 & cols. 7 – 8); and

7. a job scheduler configured to allocate at least one job based on said parameters to at least one enterprise scheduling agent and to submit the allocated jobs to said at least one enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 42 – col. 4, line 30 & cols. 7 – 8).

8. Referencing claim 2, Barroux teaches a job data management device configured to maintain job data and job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 9, lines 13 – 23 & col. 11, lines 16 – 48).

9. Referencing claim 3, Barroux teaches said job histories include information received from each enterprise scheduling agent regarding status of the jobs submitted, (e.g. col. 11, lines 16 – 48).

10. Referencing claim 4, Barroux teaches said job data management device is utilized by said job scheduler to set parameters in jobs to be submitted to said enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 9 & col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 44).

Art Unit: 2143

11. Referencing claim 5, Barroux teaches a job history repository that saves both jobs and job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 9, lines 5 - 40);

12. wherein each enterprise scheduling agent comprises,

13. an agent communicator configured to send and receive messages between said job scheduler and the enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 36),

14. a job manager configured to setup, launch, run, and manage jobs submitted to the enterprise scheduling agent, a data manager configured to update and delete data from said job history repository, (e.g. col. 7, line 61 – col. 8, line 10), and

15. a low level API configured to handle internal functions of said enterprise scheduling agent (LES Agent), file management, and message handling functions, (e.g. col. 3, line 43 – col. 4, line 15 & col. 15, line 57 – col. 16, line 13).

16. Referencing claim 6, Barroux teaches an enterprise communicator configured to construct and communicate messages between said job scheduler and each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 18, line 40 – col. 19, line 3); and

17. a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 36);

18. wherein said data manager updates said job history via enterprise communicator messages sent from the enterprise scheduler to said job data management device, (e.g. col. 11, lines 16 – 38).

Art Unit: 2143

19. Referencing claim 7, Barroux teaches a command line device configured to accept commands regarding administration of jobs submitted to the enterprise scheduling agents, (e.g. col.15, line 57 – col. 16, line 67); and

20. a job administration device configured to communicate said command line to at least one of said enterprise scheduling agents for execution, (e.g. col.15, line 57 – col. 16, line 67).

21. Referencing claim 12, Barroux teaches an enterprise communicator configured to send messages between said job scheduler and each of said enterprise scheduling agents, (e.g. col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 55).

22. Referencing claim 13, Barroux teaches each enterprise scheduling agent is registered at a specific node address that identifies each enterprise scheduling agent with a unique datagroup, (e.g. col. 15, line 42 – col. 16, line 13); and

23. said enterprise communicator encodes each message with at least one destination corresponding to a datagroup to direct each message to at least one enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 15, line 42 – col. 16, line 13).

24. Referencing claim 17, Barroux teaches an autologin device configured to accept login parameters from a user submitting a job, (e.g. col. 15, line 57 – col. 16, line 14);

25. wherein said login parameters are utilized by an enterprise scheduling agent to launch and execute the job submitted, (e.g. col. 15, line 57 – col. 16, line 14).

Art Unit: 2143

26. Referencing claim 19, Barroux teaches said presentation system includes,
27. a GUI interface that accepts user inputs for scheduling and specifying a job to be submitted, (e.g. cols. 7 – 8 & Figs. 6A – 6D);
28. wherein said GUI interface includes facilities for selection and creation of a scheduling calendar, selection of a start date and time, selection of recurring job run intervals, and selection of an immediate job run, (e.g. cols. 7 – 8 & Figs. 6A – 6D).
29. Referencing claim 24, Barroux teaches said presentation system includes,
30. a strategy scheduling window configured to allow a user to view, create, modify, and delete schedules for a strategy, (e.g. cols. 7 – 8).
31. Referencing claim 25, Barroux teaches a method of scheduling jobs across multiple networked computing platforms, comprising:
32. determining at least one job based on job parameters for at least one job to be scheduled, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 30 & col. 18, line 40 – col. 19, line 67);
33. sending said at least one job to at least one scheduling agent maintained on a selected nodes of said computer platforms, ( e.g. col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 44 & cols. 7 – 8); and
34. executing each job on the selected node under management of said scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 42 – col. 4, line 30 & cols. 7 – 8).
35. Referencing claim 26, Barroux teaches monitoring progress of the executing job, (e.g. col. 19, lines 45 - 67); and

Art Unit: 2143

36. displaying said progress on a progress monitor, (e.g. col. 8, lines 50 – 56).
37. Referencing claim 27, Barroux teaches recording each job and a history of each job in a job history repository, (e.g. col. 11, lines 16 – 38 & col. 18, line 57 – col. 19, line 3).
38. Referencing claim 31, Barroux teaches retrieving said job parameters from one of a product and a user interface that collects said job parameters, (e.g. col. 4, line 37 – col. 5, line 44 & cols. 7 – 8);
39. validating said job parameters, (e.g. col. 4, line 37 – col. 5, line 44 & cols. 7 – 8); and
40. allocating a job based on said job parameters, (e.g. col. 4, line 37 – col. 5, line 44 & cols. 7 – 8).
41. Referencing claim 40, Barroux teaches accepting a scheduling calendar identifying at
42. least on of execution times and intervals for at least one of said jobs, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 27); and
43. executing said jobs on selected nodes at the times and intervals identified in the calendar, (e.g. col. 4, lines 15 – 27).
44. Claims 44 – 50 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***



Art Unit: 2143

45. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

46. Claims 8, 14, 15, 18, 20, 21, 28 – 30, 32 – 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroux (6182110) in view of Williams et al. (5781908) (hereinafter Williams).

47. As per claim 8, Barroux does not specifically teach said commands accepted by said command line device include at least one of delete a job and all runs of the job, cancel a job's run, list all jobs, list all jobs by at least one of product code, status, and node, and rerun a job immediately. Williams teaches said commands accepted by said command line device include at least one of delete a job and all runs of the job, cancel a job's run, list all jobs, list all jobs by at least one of product code, status, and node, and rerun a job immediately, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more convenient for a system to utilize editing functions of jobs so a user can interact with how a job can be processed or to delete a process that is no longer needed.

48. As per claim 9, Barroux does not specifically teach said commands accepted by said command line device include context variables; and

Art Unit: 2143

49. said enterprise scheduling agent converts said context variables according to a current job and job parameters, and executes said commands. Williams teaches said commands accepted by said command line device include context variables, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36); and

50. said enterprise scheduling agent converts said context variables according to a current job and job parameters, and executes said commands, (e.g. col.6 line 59 – col. 8, line 36). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because of similar reasons stated above.

51. As per claim 14, Barroux does not specifically teach a local job repository installed on each of said nodes;

52. wherein:

53. each local job repository maintains job and job history information on each job submitted to the node where the local job repository is installed;

54. each local job repository is updated by the enterprise scheduling agent installed on the node where the local job repository is installed; and

55. said job information includes job parameters needed to execute each job. Williams teaches a local job repository installed on each of said

56. nodes, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43);

57. wherein:

58. each local job repository maintains job and job history information on each job submitted to the node where the local job repository is installed, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43);

Art Unit: 2143

59. each local job repository is updated by the enterprise scheduling agent installed on the node where the local job repository is installed, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43); and

60. said job information includes job parameters needed to execute each job, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more efficient for a system to keep records of jobs that have been completed so a user can view or a system can read the history to find any errors, making error detection easier.

61. As per claim 15, Barroux does not specifically teach a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent; and

62. a synchronizing device configured to synchronize each local job repository with the job histories maintained by said job data management device. Williams teaches a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43); and

63. a synchronizing device configured to synchronize each local job repository with the job histories maintained by said job data management device, (e.g. col. 7, line 63 – col. 8, line 43). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more efficient of a system to update the history of jobs so if job information becomes obsolete a user can update the job information and use the new data that would be more substantial to the user rather than out dated job information.

Art Unit: 2143

64. As per claim 18, Barroux does not specifically teach a notification scripting device configured to execute a notification script having instructions for notifying a user of status of a submitted job;

65. wherein said notification scripting device includes facilities for creating, editing, and selecting a notification script for a specific job. Williams teaches a notification scripting device configured to execute a notification script having instructions for notifying a user of status of a submitted job, (e.g. col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 26);

66. wherein said notification scripting device includes facilities for creating, editing, and selecting a notification script for a specific job, (e.g. col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 26). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more efficient if a user could monitor the job as it is being processed so to make any modification and/or aid in the detection of errors that could occur in the system.

67. As per claim 20, Barroux does not specifically teach a resource management device configured to enable a user to locate and view jobs and job runs, (e.g. cols. 7, 8). Williams teaches a resource management device configured to enable a user to locate and view jobs and job runs, (e.g. cols. 7, 8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because of similar reasons stated above.

68. As per claim 21, Barroux teaches said resource management device includes a GUI for defining an object representing a job,

69. having,
70. a general properties page having input fields for a label identifying the job, and a description of the job, (e.g. cols. 7 – 8), and
71. a repository page having a selection field for identifying a time zone for display of job times, (e.g. cols. 7 – 8). Barroux does not specifically teach a description properties page having a selection field for identifying an icon for representing the job. Williams teaches
72. a description properties page having a selection field for identifying an icon for representing the job, (e.g. cols. 7, 8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more convenient for a system to have an icon that a user could click on and have a gui appear with information about a specific job.
73. As per claim 28, Barroux does not specifically teach teaches utilizing a job data management device for, retrieving status messages regarding each job sent from a scheduling agent of a selected node of said job, and
74. updating said job history repository based on said status messages. Williams teaches utilizing a job data management device for, retrieving status messages regarding each job sent from a scheduling agent of a selected node of said job, and
75. updating said job history repository based on said status messages, (e.g. col. 3, lines 30 – 35 & col. 4, lines 30 – 59). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because for similar reasons as stated above.

76. As per claim 29, Barroux teaches maintaining a local job repositories, respectively on each of said nodes, each containing job and job history information for each job submitted to the respective node, (e.g. col. 11, lines 16 – 38 & col. 18, line 57 – col. 19, line 3).

77. As per claim 30, Barroux teaches synchronizing said job history repository with each local job repository, (e.g. col. 11, lines 16 – 38 & col. 18, line 57 – col. 19, line 3).

78. As per claim 32, Barroux does not specifically teach packaging said job parameters in a

79. communication format; and

80. transmitting the packaged job parameters from a computing platform where said job parameters are determined to said scheduling agent maintain on the selected node. Williams teaches packaging said job parameters in a

81. communication format, (e.g. cols. 7, 8); and

82. transmitting the packaged job parameters from a computing platform where said job parameters are determined to said scheduling agent maintain on the selected node, (e.g. cols. 7, 8). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more convenient for a system to utilize a communication format that is standard for the internet and if a scheduling agent is on a different system it would be efficient for a system to be able to send the information the agent needs to accomplish its job.

Art Unit: 2143

83. As per claim 33, Barroux does not specifically teach setting up the selected node to run an application program identified by said job parameters;

84. executing said application program on the selected node; and

85. monitoring progress of said application being executed. Williams teaches setting up the selected node to run an application program identified by said job parameters, (e.g. col. 3, lines 3 – 35);

86. executing said application program on the selected node, (e.g. col. 3, lines 3 – 35); and

87. monitoring progress of said application being executed, (e.g. col. 4, line 30 – col. 5, line 9). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more efficient if the system could monitor activity on a node that is running a job so to examine any occurrences that could happen in a system and intervene and/or make record of if necessary.

88. As per claim 34, Barroux does not specifically teach accepting a command line for administration of jobs submitted to said enterprise scheduling agents; and

89. communicating said command line to at least one of said enterprise scheduling agents for execution. Williams teaches accepting a command line for administration of jobs submitted to said enterprise scheduling agents, (e.g. col. 6, line 59 – col. 7, line 10); and

90. communicating said command line to at least one of said enterprise scheduling agents for execution, (e.g. col. 7, line 62 – col. 8, line 25). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because of similar reasons as stated above.

91. As per claim 35, Barroux does not specifically teach substituting context variables in said command line with data based on said context variable and the job to be administered, (e.g. col. 7, line 3 – col. 8, line 36); and

92. executing the command line. Williams teaches substituting context variables in said command line with data based on said context variable and the job to be administered, (e.g. col. 7, line 3 – col. 8, line 36); and

93. executing the command line, (e.g. col. 7, line 3 – col. 8, line 36). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Williams with Barroux because it would be more convenient if the system could substitute context variables and said command line with data based on said content variable so a user could utilize a spread sheet type outline of the variable for the jobs that are being processed.

94. Claims 10, 11 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroux (6182110) in view of Shroyer (6160988).

95. As per claim 10, Barroux does not specifically show the use of a point product device configured to provide a communication link between said enterprise scheduling agent and at least one product submitting jobs to said job scheduling device; wherein said point product device communicates job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests between each enterprise scheduling agent and said at least one product. Shroyer does teach the use of a point product device configured to provide a communication link between said



Art Unit: 2143

enterprise scheduling agent and at least one product submitting jobs to said job scheduling device; wherein said point product device communicates job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests between each enterprise scheduling agent and said at least one product, (e.g. col. 18, lines 28 – 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shroyer with Barroux because the more parameters a job has to distinct itself the less likely a user will mistake it for a different job that has similar parameters. Also if a device or user needs to update a parameter, the device or user would want the parameters transferable to their node.

96. As per claim 11, Barroux teaches a job administration device configured to accept command line inputs and communicate said command line inputs to at least one enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 18, line 40 – col. 19, line 3);

97. a job data management device configured to maintain job histories of jobs submitted to each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 36); and

98. an enterprise communicator configured to send messages between at least one of said job scheduler, point product device, job administration device, and job data management device and each of said enterprise scheduling agents, (e.g. col. 13, line 61 – col. 14, line 55).

99. As per claim 36, Barroux does not teach communicating data, including at least one of job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests for said data between a product and each enterprise scheduling agent. Shroyer teaches communicating data, including at least one of job status, job logfile, setup, cancel, job parameter functions, and requests for said

Art Unit: 2143

data between a product and each enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 18, lines 28 – 52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shroyer and Barroux because the user or a device that needs the parameters, would want them transferable to there node.

100. Claims 16, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroux (6182110) in view of Jerome et al. (6323882) (hereinafter Jerome).

101. As per claim 16, Barroux does not specifically teach a progress monitor configured to monitor and display execution of at least one of said jobs; wherein:

102. said progress monitor provides a visual display of, an identification of said job and a current phase of said job, a percentage complete of said job, and a percentage complete of said current phase. Jerome teach a progress monitor configured to monitor and display execution of at least one of said jobs; wherein:

103. said progress monitor provides a visual display of, an identification of said job and a current phase of said job, a percentage complete of said job, and a percentage complete of said current phase, (e.g. col. 10, line 51 – col. 11, line 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jerome with Barroux because it allows the users to have a more defined view of how the jobs are being operated on.

104. As per claim 41, Barroux does not teach providing a description of at least one of said jobs, including a written description, a label, and an icon selected to represent said job; and

Art Unit: 2143

105. identifying a time zone for display of job times. Jerome teaches providing a description of at least one of said jobs, including a written description, a label, and an icon selected to represent said job, (e.g. col. 9, lines 15 – 65); and

106. identifying a time zone for display of job times, (e.g. col. 9, lines 15 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Jerome with Barroux because it allows the users to have a more defined view of how the jobs are being operated on.

107. Claims 22, 42, 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroux (6182110) in view of Bromley et al. (5819263) (hereinafter Bromley).

108. As per claim 22, Barroux does not teach objects defined by said resource management device comprise,

109. a hierarchy of folders including at least one of an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a job by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder.

Bromley teaches objects defined by said resource management device comprise,

110. a hierarchy of folders including at least one of an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a job by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder, (e.g. col. 15, lines 30 – 47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bromley with Barroux because it would keep all the information that needs to be saved in an organized manner.

Art Unit: 2143

111. As per claim 42, Barroux does not teach placing information about job times and status in an object containing folders, each folder identifying a categorization of jobs contained therein, including, an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a jobs by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder. Bromley teaches placing information about job times and status in an object containing folders, each folder identifying a categorization of jobs contained therein, including, an all jobs folder, a jobs by group folder, a jobs by node folder, a jobs by product folder, a jobs by type folder, and a jobs by user folder, (e.g. col. 15, lines 30 – 47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bromley with Barroux because it would keep all the information that needs to be saved in an organized manner.

112. As per claim 43, Barroux does not teach organizing said all jobs folder to maintain additional folders, including, at least one of, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job,

113. an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status, including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs,

114. a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time, and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run. Bromley teaches organizing said all jobs folder to maintain additional folders, including, at least one of, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job, (e.g. col. 15, lines 30 – 47),

Art Unit: 2143

115. an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status, including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs, (e.g. col. 16, line 2 – col. 17, line 56),

116. a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time, and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run, (e.g. col. 16, line 2 – col. 17, line 56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bromley with Barroux because it would keep all the information that needs to be saved in an organized manner.

117. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroux (6182110) in view of Bromley et al. (5819263), and Russell et al. (5537550) (hereinafter Russell).

118. As per claim 23, Barroux does not specifically teach said all jobs folder includes folders, including, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job, an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status,

119. including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs, a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time,

120. and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run. Bromley and Russell teaches folders, including, an all jobs any status folder listing jobs regardless of status and associated job history of each job, an all runs by status folder listing jobs according to status, (e.g. Bromley, col. 15, lines 30 – 62),

Art Unit: 2143

121. including completed runs, failed runs, not started runs, preempted runs, running runs, and stopped runs, (e.g. Russell, col. 13, line 62 – col. 14, line 14),

122. a held jobs folder listing jobs that are held and can be scheduled for a later time, and a scheduled jobs folder listing jobs that are scheduled to run, (e.g. Bromley, col. 15, lines 30 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with the combined system of Barroux and Bromley because of the visual convenience of seeing a folder with information as apposed to a database.

123. Claims 37 – 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barroux (6182110) in view of Russell et al. (5537550).

124. As per claim 37, Barroux does not teach registering each enterprise scheduling agent at a node address that identifies the registered enterprise scheduling agent with a unique datagroup;

125. communicating jobs and job administration commands and requests with each enterprise scheduling agent via messages; and

126. encoding each message sent to a recipient enterprise scheduling agent with at least one destination corresponding to a datagroup that directs said message to the recipient enterprise scheduling agent. Russell teaches registering each enterprise scheduling agent at a node address that identifies the registered enterprise scheduling agent with a unique datagroup, (e.g. col. 13, line 62 – col. 14, line 14);

127. communicating jobs and job administration commands and requests with each enterprise scheduling agent via messages, (e.g. col. 10, lines 1 – 33); and

Art Unit: 2143

128. encoding each message sent to a recipient enterprise scheduling agent with at least one destination corresponding to a datagroup that directs said message to the recipient enterprise scheduling agent, (e.g. col. 28, lines 10 – 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with Barroux because it is more efficient to send specific messages or jobs to a specific group that deals with a specific job this would free up time and space for other messages or jobs to be processed on other nodes.

129. As per claim 38, Barroux does not teach retrieving autologin parameters from a user scheduling an autologin job; and

130. launching execution of said job utilizing said autologin parameters. Russell teaches retrieving autologin parameters from a user scheduling an autologin job, (e.g. col. 45, lines 10 – 27); and

131. launching execution of said job utilizing said autologin parameters, (e.g. col. 45, lines 10 – 27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with Barroux because of the convenience of the user not having to login parameters.

132. As per claim 39, Barroux does not specifically teach retrieving a notification script for a job being submitted; and

133. executing the notification script on at least one of completion of said job and at a requested status point. Russell teaches retrieving a notification script for a job being submitted, (e.g. col. 6, lines 21 – 61); and

Art Unit: 2143

134. executing the notification script on at least one of completion of said job and at a requested status point, (e.g. col. 6, lines 21 – 61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Russell with Barroux because it is an efficient way for a user to acknowledge another job completion or status therefore, allowing a user to assign another specific job to the same node or group.

### ***Response to Arguments***

135. Applicant's arguments filed 07/25/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

136. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that states Barroux is not understood to teach or suggest a device for *scheduling jobs to run on nodes* comprising a scheduling agent installed on each node and configured to *launch execution of jobs submitted to the agent*, a presentation system configured to accept and validate parameters identifying at least one job to be submitted for execution on at least one of the nodes and a job scheduler configured to allocate at least one job to at least one enterprise scheduling agent based on the parameters and to submit the allocated jobs to the at least one enterprise scheduling agent, as recited in independent claim 1.

137. As to part 1, Examiner would like to draw the Applicant's attention to the rejection that is restated above and the specific section that teach the claimed invention. Barroux teaches each



Art Unit: 2143

node having an agent and configured to launch execution of jobs submitted to the agent, (e.g. col. 3, line 43 – col. 4, line 30 & col. 11, line 60 – col. 12, line 41). Quoting Barroux, “These agents must be installed on hosts 218,” (e.g. col. 11, line 67). Further quoting Barroux, “Another aspect of task scheduling is selecting which tasks are to be run on which nodes,” (e.g. col. 5, lines 57 – 58). Applicant admits that a user can schedule a node-specific survey task across a network. Barroux discloses as a survey task which falls under the category of “job” to be executed. If the Applicant was more specific about the type of job that is to be executed it could overcome the art of Barroux but would require further search and consideration. These sections along with others stated above prove that Barroux teaches the limitations of claim 1 and others that are of similar nature, (claim 46).

138. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that states that they find not teaching or suggestion of a method of scheduling jobs across multiple networked computing platforms, comprising the steps of determining at least one job based on job parameters for at least one job to be scheduled, sending said at least one job to at least one scheduling agent maintained on a selected nodes of said computer platforms, and executing each job on the selected node under management of said scheduling agent, as recited in independent claim 25 and for similar reasons with independent claim 45.

139. As to part 2, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Art Unit: 2143

140. Furthermore, these limitations can be found in the reply to Applicant's argument above in part 1 and further in the rejected claims that are stated above.

***Conclusion***

141. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 2143

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De   
October 1, 2003

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER